arXiv:math/0411230v1 [math.QA] 10 Nov 2004

THE STRUCTURE OF WEAK COALGEBRA-GALOIS EXTENSIONS

TOMASZ BRZEZIŃSKI, RYAN B. TURNER, AND ADAM P. WRIGHTSON

Abstract. Weak coalgebra-Galois extensions are studied. A notion of an invertible weak entwining structure is introduced. It is proven that, within an invertible weak entwining structure, the surjectivity of the canonical map implies bijectivity provided the structure coalgebra C is either coseparable or projective as a C-comodule.

1. Introduction

Galois-type extensions of non-commutative algebras play the role of (schemes of) non-commutative principal bundles. The study of generalised Galois extensions was initiated by Kreimer and Takeuchi in [23] in terms of Hopf-Galois extensions and beautifully developed and generalised, in particular by Doi, Takeuchi and Schneider (cf. [28]). In recent years, in view of the role they play in non-commutative geometry, Hopf-Galois extensions went through a series of further generalisations, thus leading to the notion of a coalgebra-Galois extension (cf. [11], [10]), and, most recently, a weak coalgebra-Galois extension (cf. [7], [13]), a weak Hopf-Galois extension (see [14] for the definition and [22] for an action-free characterisation) and a Hopf algebroid Galois extension (cf. [21], [3]). It has been realised in [7] that the general algebraic structure underlying all these Galois-type extensions is that of a coring, termed a *Galois coring* (cf. [32]). This, in turn, is a special case of a Galois coring without a grouplike element or a *Galois comodule* introduced in [17] and recently studied in [8], [15], [33].

To have a Galois property means that a certain map, usually called a *canonical map*, must be an isomorphism (or, at least, a bijection). One of the most useful results in the standard Hopf-Galois theory is the theorem of Schneider that states that it is often enough to prove that the canonical map is an epimorphism to conclude that it is an isomorphism. This result proves particularly useful in constructing explicit examples of Hopf-Galois extensions, of which there has been a plethora recently, in particular within a realm of the non-commutative geometry. Schneider's theorem is also very natural from the geometric point of view. Hopf-Galois extensions correspond to principal bundles. These are given in terms of free actions of Lie groups on manifolds. Freeness means surjectivity of the canonical map. In differential geometry the bijectivity then follows by dimension-type arguments that cannot be transferred directly in the algebra context. In [8, Theorem 4.4] it has been shown that the Schneider theorem has in fact a coring origin. In the (most general, so far) case of Galois comodules it is enough to check that the canonical map is a split epimorphism (in a suitable category) to conclude that it is an isomorphism. This then has been applied to bijective entwining structures with a coseparable coalgebra to deduce that

---

Date: November 2004.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W30.

the surjectivity of the canonical map suffices to prove that there is a coalgebra-Galois extension (see also [27] for a different, coring-free, approach).

The aim of the present paper is to apply [8, Theorem 4.4] to weak-entwining structures of Caenepeel and De Groot [13] and thus to prove a Schneider-type structure theorem for weak coalgebra-Galois extensions (hence, also, weak Hopf-Galois extensions as a special case). The present paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we set up the notation and conventions, give preliminary results on corings and we also give a formulation of [8, Theorem 4.4] over a general commutative ring. This is a mild generalisation of [8, Theorem 4.4] which was originally stated for vector spaces rather than modules, but it can be useful for studying most general Galois-type extensions. As the studies of weak entwining structures and weak Hopf algebras require one to have a number of equalities etc., readily available, we devote Section 3 to collecting such useful formulae that are needed for calculations in later sections. We also show that one can associate a weak coalgebra-Galois extension to any comodule subalgebra of a weak Hopf algebra. In Section 4 we determine the proper notion of an invertible weak entwining structure (the naive bijectivity of an entwining map forces a weak entwining structure to be an entwining structure). Section 5 contains the first main theorem: in the case of an invertible weak entwining structure with a coseparable coalgebra, suffices it to prove that the canonical map is an epimorphism to prove that there is a weak coalgebra-Galois extension. An example includes a weak Hopf-Galois extension by a weak Hopf algebra with bijective antipode. Finally in Section 6 we prove the second main result: within an invertible weak entwining structure, if a coalgebra is projective as a comodule, then surjectivity of the canonical map implies the bijectivity. As a special case one obtains the following weak Hopf algebra generalisation of the Kreimer-Takeuchi theorem [23, Theorem 1.7]: for a finite dimensional weak Hopf algebra over a field, the surjectivity of the canonical map implies its bijectivity.

2. Corings and Galois comodules

2.1. **Preliminaries on corings and Galois comodules.** We work over a commutative ring k with a unit. All algebras are over k, associative and with a unit. The product in an algebra is denoted by μ and the unit, both as an element and as a map, is denoted by 1. Unadorned tensor product between k-modules is over k. All coalgebras are over k, coassociative and with a counit. In a coalgebra C, the coproduct is denoted by Δ_C and the counit by ε_C. For a ring (k-algebra) A, the category of right A-modules and right A-linear maps is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_A$. Symmetric notation is used for left modules. The dual module of a right A-module M is denoted by M^*, while the dual of a left A-module N is denoted by ${}^*N$. The product in the endomorphism ring of a right module (comodule) is given by composition of maps.

Let A be an algebra. A coproduct in an A-coring $\mathfrak{C}$ is denoted by $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{C}\otimes_A\mathfrak{C}$, and the counit is denoted by $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathfrak{C} \to A$. To indicate the action of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}$ we use the Sweedler sigma notation, i.e., for all $c \in \mathfrak{C}$,

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(c) = \sum c_{(1)}\otimes c_{(2)}, \qquad (\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}\otimes_A\mathfrak{C}) \circ \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(c) = (\mathfrak{C}\otimes_A\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}) \circ \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(c) = \sum c_{(1)}\otimes c_{(2)}\otimes c_{(3)},$$

etc. Capital Gothic letters always denote corings. The category of right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules and right $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear maps is denoted by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$. Recall that any right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule is also a right A-module, and any right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule map is right A-linear. For a right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule M, $\varrho^M : M \to M\otimes_A\mathfrak{C}$ denotes a coaction, and $\mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, N)$ is the

k-module of $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear maps $M \to N$. On elements ϱ^M is denoted by the Sweedler notation $\varrho^M(m) = \sum m_{[0]} \otimes m_{[1]}$. Symmetric notation is used for left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules. In particular, the coaction of a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule N is denoted by ${}^N\varrho$, and, on elements, by ${}^N\varrho(n) = \sum n_{[-1]} \otimes n_{[0]} \in \mathfrak{C} \otimes_A N$. The same rules of notation apply to comodules over a coalgebra. A detailed account of the theory of corings and comodules can be found in [12].

Given right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules M and N, the k-module $\mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, N)$ is a right module of the endomorphism ring $B = \mathrm{End}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M)$ with the standard action $fb = f \circ b$, for all $f \in \mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, N)$, $b \in B$. This defines a functor $\mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, -) : \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}} \to \mathcal{M}_B$, which has the left adjoint $- \otimes_B M : \mathcal{M}_B \to \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ (cf. [12, 18.21]). The counit of the adjunction is given by the evaluation map

$$\varphi_N : \mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, N) \otimes_B M \to N, \quad f \otimes m \mapsto f(m),$$

Similar adjoint functors exist for left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules. In this case the counit is denoted by $\widehat{\varphi}_N$.

View $\mathfrak{C}$ as a right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule with the regular coaction $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}$. M is called a *Galois (right) comodule* if M is a finitely generated and projective right A-module, and the evaluation map $\varphi_{\mathfrak{C}} : \mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, \mathfrak{C}) \otimes_B M \to \mathfrak{C}$ is an isomorphism of right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules.

Equivalently, Galois comodules are defined as follows. If M is a finitely generated projective right A-module, then $M^* \otimes_B M$ is an A-coring with the coproduct $\Delta_{M^* \otimes_B M}(\xi \otimes m) = \sum_i \xi \otimes e^i \otimes \xi^i \otimes m$, where $\{e^i \in M, \xi^i \in M^*\}$ is a dual basis of M_A, and with the counit $\varepsilon_{M^* \otimes_B M}(\xi \otimes m) = \xi(m)$ (cf. [17]). In view of the isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M, \mathfrak{C}) \simeq M^* = \mathrm{Hom}_{-A}(M, A)$, $\varphi_{\mathfrak{C}}$ becomes the *canonical* A-coring map

$$\mathrm{can}_M : M^* \otimes_B M \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad \xi \otimes m \mapsto \sum \xi(m_{[0]}) m_{[1]}.$$

M (with M_A finitely generated projective) is a Galois comodule if and only if the canonical map can_M is an isomorphism of corings.

A Galois comodule M with the endomorphism ring B is called a *principal comodule* if it is projective as a left B-module.

If M is a right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule that is finitely generated and projective as a right A-module, then M^* is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule with the coaction ${}^{M^*}\varrho(\xi) = \sum_i \xi(e^i{}_{[0]}) e^i{}_{[1]} \otimes \xi^i$, where $\{e^i \in M, \xi^i \in M^*\}$ is a dual basis of M. The endomorphism ring of M^* (as a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule) is isomorphic to the endomorphism ring of M. One can develop the theory of left Galois and principal comodules along the same lines as for the right comodule case. In particular if M is a right Galois comodule, then M^* is a left Galois comodule.

The case in which A is a Galois $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule is of fundamental importance. In this case the coaction $\varrho^A : A \to A \otimes_A \mathfrak{C} \simeq \mathfrak{C}$ is fully determined by a group-like element $g = \varrho^A(1) \in \mathfrak{C}$, i.e., $\varrho^A(a) = ga$. The endomorphism ring $B = \mathrm{End}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(A)$ coincides with the subalgebra of g-coinvariants in A, i.e., $B = A_g^{co\mathfrak{C}} := \{b \in A \mid bg = gb\}$. Obviously, A is a finitely generated projective right A-module, $A^* \simeq A$, and $A \otimes_B A$ is the *Sweedler A-coring*, with coproduct $a \otimes a' \mapsto a \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes a'$ and counit $a \otimes a' \mapsto aa'$. The canonical map comes out as

$$\mathrm{can}_A : A \otimes_B A \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad a \otimes a' \mapsto aga'. \tag{2.1}$$

Thus A is a Galois comodule if and only if $\mathfrak{C}$ is a *Galois coring* with respect to g, a notion introduced in [7].

2.2. **Split canonical epimorphisms are isomorphisms.** The aim of the present paper is to apply [8, Theorem 4.4] to the case of weak entwining structures and thus to infer that, similarly to the case of invertible entwining structures dealt with in [8, Theorem 4.6], in many cases it is sufficient to prove that the canonical map is surjective to conclude that it is an isomorphism. Theorem 4.4 in [8] is formulated for algebras over a field as this is the most interesting case from the non-commutative geometry point of view, which was the main motivation for introducing the notion of a principal comodule. However, the methods of proof of Theorem 4.4 can easily be extended to general algebras over a commutative ring. For the completeness we give a version of [8, Theorem 4.4] for algebras over a commutative ring.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be an A-coring and M a right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule that is finitely generated and projective as a right A-module. Let $B = \mathrm{End}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M)$. Suppose that:*

(a) $\mathfrak{C}$ is a flat left A-module;

(b) the map

$$B\otimes M \to \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, M^*\otimes M), \qquad b\otimes m \mapsto [\xi \mapsto \xi \circ b\otimes m]$$

is an isomorphism of left B-modules;

(c) the map

$$\widetilde{can}_M : M^*\otimes M \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad \xi\otimes m \mapsto \sum \xi(m_{[0]})m_{[1]},$$

is a split epimorphism of left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules.

Then M is a Galois comodule and M is a k-relatively projective left B-module (meaning that any B-module epimorphism $N \to M$ that splits as a k-module map splits as a B-module map).

Proof. Note that the assumption (b) incorporates the part of [8, Lemma 4.5] that is used for the proof of [8, Theorem 4.4]. Once this is realised, the same method of proof as in [8, Theorem 4.4] can be used. We repeat the main arguments for completeness.

By assumption (c), the coring $\mathfrak{C}$ is a direct summand of $M^*\otimes M$ as a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule, hence, in view of assumption (b), $\mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, \mathfrak{C}) \simeq {}^*(M^*) \simeq M$ is a direct summand of a left B-module $B\otimes M$. Since $B\otimes M$ is a k-relatively projective left B-module, so is M.

The counit of the adjunction $\widehat{\varphi}_{M^*\otimes M} : M^*\otimes_B \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, M^*\otimes M) \to M^*\otimes M$ factorises through the isomorphism in assumption (b) tensored with M^*, and through the obvious isomorphism $M^*\otimes_B B\otimes M \to M^*\otimes M$. Hence $\widehat{\varphi}_{M^*\otimes M}$ is an isomorphism. Next we can consider the following diagram, which is commutative in all possible directions since $\widehat{\varphi}$ is a natural transformation,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M^*\otimes_B \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, M^*\otimes M) \arrow[r, "\widehat{\varphi}_{M^*\otimes M}"] \arrow[d, shift left, "M^*\otimes_B \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, \widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_M)"] & M^*\otimes M \arrow[d, shift left, "\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_M"] \\
M^*\otimes_B \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, \mathfrak{C}) \arrow[r, "\widehat{\varphi}_{\mathfrak{C}}"] \arrow[u, shift left] & \mathfrak{C} \arrow[u, shift left]
\end{tikzcd}$$

The upward pointing arrows are sections of $M^*\otimes_B \mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*, \widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_M)$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_M$ respectively. Since $\widehat{\varphi}_{M^*\otimes M}$ is an isomorphism, the map $\widehat{\varphi}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is bijective (it is a k-linear isomorphism). The identifications $\mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*,\mathfrak{C})\simeq M$ and $M^*\simeq \mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M,\mathfrak{C})$ lead to a k-linear isomorphism $M^*\otimes_B\mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(M^*,\mathfrak{C})\simeq \mathrm{Hom}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M,\mathfrak{C})\otimes_B M$. In view of this isomorphism, the fact that $\widehat{\varphi}_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is bijective implies that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is bijective. By assumption, $\mathfrak{C}$ is a flat left A-module, so $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ is an Abelian category. Since $\varphi_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is a bijective morphism in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$, it is an isomorphism. Thus M is a Galois right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule. □

The assumption (b) in Theorem 2.1 is satisfied if M is a flat k-module. Thus Theorem 2.1 implies the following

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be an A-coring and M a right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule that is finitely generated and projective as a right A-module. Let $B=\mathrm{End}^{-\mathfrak{C}}(M)$. Suppose that:*

(a) $\mathfrak{C}$ is a flat left A-module;

(b) M is a projective k-module;

(c) the map

$$\widetilde{can}_M : M^*\otimes M\to\mathfrak{C},\qquad \xi\otimes m\mapsto\sum\xi(m_{[0]})m_{[1]},$$

is a split epimorphism of left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules.

Then M is a principal comodule.

Proof. A projective module is flat, hence assumption (b) in Corollary 2.2 implies assumption (b) in Theorem 2.1. Since M is a k-relatively projective left B module and M is a projective k-module, M is a projective B-module, hence a principal comodule as required. □

Remark 2.3. (1) Note that the assumption that $\mathfrak{C}$ is a flat left A-module in Theorem 2.1 is made to ensure that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ is an Abelian category (so that every bijection in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$ is an isomorphism). Without this assumption the arguments of the proof of Theorem 2.1 imply that $\varphi_{\mathfrak{C}}$, hence also can_M, is a k-linear isomorphism. Thus, skipping assumption (a), one can prove that M is a *Galois module in a weaker sense* considered in special cases by some authors (cf. [3], [27]).

(2) In the case of an A-coring $\mathfrak{C}$ with a grouplike element g and the right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule $M=A$, the dual $M^*=A$ and

$$\mathrm{Hom}^{\mathfrak{C}-}(A,A\otimes A)={}^{co\mathfrak{C}}(A\otimes A)_g:=\{\sum_i a_i\otimes b_i\in A\otimes A\mid \sum_i ga_i\otimes b_i=\sum_i a_ig\otimes b_i\}.$$

Hence the map in Theorem 2.1 (a) comes out as

$$B\otimes A\to {}^{co\mathfrak{C}}(A\otimes A)_g,\qquad b\otimes a\mapsto b\otimes a.$$

Thus the condition (a) means in this case that

$$B\otimes A=\{\sum_i a_i\otimes b_i\in A\otimes A\mid \sum_i ga_i\otimes b_i=\sum_i a_ig\otimes b_i\},$$

and appears in this form in [3] and [27].

3. Weak entwining structures and weak Hopf algebras

3.1. **Weak entwining structures and weak coalgebra Galois extensions.** Motivated by a connection between entwining structures and Doi-Koppinen modules ([6], see also [16] and [12, Chapter 5] for reviews), weak entwining structures were introduced in [13] as a structure behind a weak Doi-Koppinen datum defined in [2]. A right-right weak entwining structure is a triple (A, C, ψ_R), where A is a k-algebra, C is a k-coalgebra, and $\psi_R : C \otimes A \to A \otimes C$ is a k-linear map, which, writing $\psi_R(c \otimes a) = \sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha$, $\psi_R(c \otimes a) = \sum_\beta a_\beta \otimes c^\beta$, etc., satisfies the following relations:

$$\sum_\alpha (ab)_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a_\alpha b_\beta \otimes c^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) 1_\alpha a, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes \Delta_C(c^\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a_{\alpha\beta} \otimes {c_{(1)}}^\beta \otimes {c_{(2)}}^\alpha, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha = \sum_\alpha \varepsilon_C({c_{(1)}}^\alpha) 1_\alpha \otimes c_{(2)}. \tag{3.4}$$

An example of a right-right weak entwining structure is provided by a *right-right entwining structure* (A, C, ψ_R). Recall from [11] that this is defined by requiring that equations (3.1) and (3.3) are satisfied, while equations (3.2) and (3.4) are replaced by

$$\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) = \varepsilon_C(c) a, \qquad \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha = 1 \otimes c.$$

Similarly a *left-left weak entwining structure* over k is a triple (A, C, ψ_L) consisting of an algebra A, a coalgebra C, and a k-linear map $\psi_L : A \otimes C \to C \otimes A$ such that, writing $\psi_L(a \otimes c) = \sum_E c_E \otimes a^E$, $\psi_L(a \otimes c) = \sum_F c_F \otimes a^F$ etc., the following relations

$$\sum_E c_E \otimes (ab)^E = \sum_{E,F} c_{EF} \otimes a^F b^E, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\sum_E \varepsilon_C(c_E) a^E = \sum_E a \varepsilon_C(c_E) 1^E, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\sum_E \Delta_C(c_E) \otimes a^E = \sum_{E,F} c_{(1)E} \otimes c_{(2)F} \otimes a^{EF}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E = \sum_E c_{(1)} \otimes \varepsilon_C(c_{(2)E}) 1^E \tag{3.8}$$

are satisfied.

Throughout this paper the repeated lower case Greek indices in a *down-up Einstein convention*, such as $\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha$, always denote the action of a right-right weak entwining structure. Similarly, the repeated upper-case Latin indices E, F as in $\sum_E c_E \otimes a^E$ denote the action of a left-left weak entwining structure.

Let (A, C, ψ_R) be a right-right weak entwining structure. A k-module M together with a right A-action and a right C-coaction is called a *weak entwined module over* (A, C, ψ_R) if

$$\varrho^M(ma) = \sum_\alpha m_{[0]} a_\alpha \otimes {m_{[1]}}^\alpha, \tag{3.9}$$

for all $m \in M$ and $a \in A$. The category of weak entwined modules and A-linear C-colinear maps is denoted be $\mathcal{M}(\psi_R)_A^C$. Similarly, given a left-left weak entwining structure (A, C, ψ_L), a k-module M together with a left A-action and a left C-coaction is called a *weak entwined module over* (A, C, ψ_L) if

$$ {}^{M}\varrho(am) = \sum_{E} m_{[-1]E} \otimes a^{E} m_{[0]} \tag{3.10}$$

for all $m \in M$ and $a \in A$. The category of weak entwined modules over (A, C, ψ_L) and A-linear C-colinear maps is denoted by ${}^{C}_{A}\mathcal{M}(\psi_L)$.

The most natural point of view on weak entwining structures and associated modules is provided by corings and their comodules[1]. As shown in [7], to any right-right weak entwining structure (A, C, ψ_R) one can associate an A-coring $\mathfrak{C}$ such that the category of right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules is isomorphic to the category of weak entwined modules over (A, C, ψ_R). As understanding of this fact is crucial to what follows, we quote it in full.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* (A, C, ψ_R) *be a right-right weak entwining structure. Let*

$$p_R : A \otimes C \to A \otimes C, \qquad p_R = (\mu \otimes C) \circ (A \otimes \psi_R) \circ (A \otimes C \otimes 1),$$

and

$$\mathfrak{C} = \operatorname{Im} p_R = \{\sum_{i,\alpha} a_i 1_\alpha \otimes c_i^\alpha \mid \sum_i a_i \otimes c_i \in A \otimes C\}$$

Then p_R *is a projection, i.e.,* $p_R \circ p_R = p_R$, *and*

1. $\mathfrak{C}$ *is an* (A, A)*-bimodule with the left action* $a'(\sum_\alpha a' 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha a' a 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha$ *and the right action* $(\sum_\alpha a' 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) a = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a' 1_\alpha a_\beta \otimes c^{\alpha\beta}$.
2. $\mathfrak{C}$ *is an* A*-coring with coproduct* $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}} = (A \otimes \Delta_C)|_{\mathfrak{C}}$ *and counit* $\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{C}} = (A \otimes \varepsilon_C)|_{\mathfrak{C}}$. *Explicitly, for all* $a \in A$, $c \in C$,
$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sum_\alpha a 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha a 1_\alpha \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(1)} \otimes_A 1 \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(2)} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a 1_\alpha \otimes {c_{(1)}}^{\alpha} \otimes_A 1_\beta \otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\beta}.$$
3. $\mathcal{M}(\psi_R)^C_A = \mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{C}}$

In a similar way, to a left-left weak entwining structure (A, C, ψ_L), one can associate a projection

$$p_L : C \otimes A \to C \otimes A, \qquad p_L = (C \otimes \mu) \circ (\psi_L \otimes A) \circ (1 \otimes C \otimes A),$$

and an A-coring

$$\mathfrak{D} = \operatorname{Im} p_L = \{\sum_{i,E} c^i_E \otimes 1^E a^i \mid \sum_i c^i \otimes a^i \in C \otimes A\}.$$

In this case $\mathfrak{D}$ is an (A, A)-bimodule with the left multiplication $a(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a') = \sum_{E,F} c_{EF} \otimes a^F 1^E a'$ and the right multiplication $(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a')a = \sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a' a$. The coproduct and the counit of $\mathfrak{D}$ are obtained by restricting of $\Delta_C \otimes A$ and $\varepsilon_C \otimes A$, respectively, to $\operatorname{Im} p_L$.

The following example, taken from [7], recalls the definition of the main object of studies of the present paper.

---

[1] Note that weak entwining structures we discuss in this paper are *self-dual* entwining structures in terminology of [12]. More general weak entwining structures discussed in [12] are best described in terms of *weak corings* [31].

Example 3.2. Let C be a coalgebra, A an algebra and a right C-comodule with the coaction ϱ^A. Let

$$B = A^{\mathrm{co}C} = \{b \in A |\ \forall a \in A,\ \varrho^A(ba) = b\varrho^A(a)\},$$

and let

$$\overline{\mathrm{can}} : A \otimes_B A \to A \otimes C, \qquad a \otimes_B a' \mapsto a\varrho^A(a')$$

View $A \otimes_B A$ as a left A-module via $\mu \otimes_B A$ and a right C-comodule via $A \otimes_B \varrho^A$. View $A \otimes C$ as a left A-module via $\mu \otimes C$ and as a right C-comodule via $A \otimes \Delta_C$. Now suppose the $\overline{\mathrm{can}}$ is a split monomorphism in the category of left A-modules and right C-comodules, i.e., there exists a left A-module, right C-comodule map $\sigma : A \otimes C \to A \otimes_B A$ such that $\sigma \circ \overline{\mathrm{can}} = A \otimes_B A$. Let $\tau : C \to A \otimes_B A$, $c \mapsto \sigma(1 \otimes c)$. Define

$$\psi_R^\sigma : C \otimes A \to A \otimes C, \qquad \psi_R^\sigma = \overline{\mathrm{can}} \circ (A \otimes_B \mu) \circ (\tau \otimes A)$$

Then (A, C, ψ_R^σ) is a weak entwining structure. The extension of algebras $B \subseteq A$ is called a (right) *weak coalgebra-Galois C-extension* and (A, C, ψ_R^σ) is called a *canonical right-right weak entwining structure* associated to the weak coalgebra-Galois C-extension $B \subseteq A$.

By Proposition 3.1, any weak coalgebra-Galois C-extension $B \subseteq A$ induces a coring $\mathfrak{C} = \mathrm{Im}\, p_R$ associated to the canonical weak entwining structure (A, C, ψ_R^σ). As observed in [7], the coring $\mathfrak{C}$ is a Galois coring, i.e., A is a Galois comodule. Conversely, suppose (A, C, ψ_R) is a right-right entwining structure, and $\mathfrak{C} = \mathrm{Im}\, p_R$ is the corresponding coring. Suppose further that A is a right Galois $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule, and let B be the subalgebra of coinvariants. If A is a Galois right comodule, then $B \subseteq A$ is a weak coalgebra-Galois C-extension and, necessarily, (A, C, ψ_R) is the canonical right-right entwining structure associated to this extension. This follows immediately from the commutative diagram of right A-module left C-comodule maps

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & A\otimes_B A \arrow[r, "\overline{\mathrm{can}}"] \arrow[d, equal] & A\otimes C \arrow[d, "p_R"] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & A\otimes_B A \arrow[r, shift left, "\mathrm{can}_A"] & \mathfrak{C} \arrow[l, shift left, "\mathrm{can}_A^{-1}"] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & & 0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where can_A is the canonical map as in equation (2.1).

Thus there are two equivalent points of view on weak coalgebra-Galois extensions: the entwining-free definition of Example 3.2 or the definition within a weak entwining structure (or, more precisely, the associated coring). We will make substantial use of this latter point of view.

3.2. **Weak Hopf algebras and weak Hopf-Galois extensions.** The notion of a weak bialgebra was introduced in [5] and [25]. The paper [4] contains a detailed account of the theory of weak bialgebras and weak Hopf algebras and is a gold mine of useful formulae and properties of weak bialgebras. A concise review of these properties (for infinite weak bialgebras over a commutative ring) can be found in [12, Section 36].

A weak k-bialgebra H is a k-module with a k-algebra structure $(\mu, 1)$ and a k-coalgebra structure (Δ, ε) such that Δ is a multiplicative map and

$$\Delta^2(1) = \sum 1_{(1)} \otimes 1_{(2)}1_{(1')} \otimes 1_{(2')} = \sum 1_{(1)} \otimes 1_{(1')}1_{(2)} \otimes 1_{(2')} \tag{3.11}$$

$$\varepsilon(hkl) = \sum \varepsilon(hk_{(1)})\varepsilon(k_{(2)}l) = \sum \varepsilon(hk_{(2)})\varepsilon(k_{(1)}l) \tag{3.12}$$

for all $h, k, l \in H$. Here $\Delta(1) = \sum 1_{(1)}\otimes 1_{(2)} = \sum 1_{(1')} \otimes 1_{(2')}$. An important role in the studies of the structure of weak bialgebras is played by the projections Π^L, Π^R, $\overline{\Pi}^L$ and $\overline{\Pi}^R$, given by

$$\Pi^L(h) = \sum \varepsilon(1_{(1)}h)1_{(2)}, \qquad \overline{\Pi}^L(h) = \sum \varepsilon(1_{(2)}h)1_{(1)},$$
$$\Pi^R(h) = \sum \varepsilon(h1_{(2)})1_{(1)}, \qquad \overline{\Pi}^R(h) = \sum \varepsilon(h1_{(1)})1_{(2)}.$$

Every weak bialgebra can be seen to be a *bialgebroid*; the above projections are used in the construction of a *base algebra* for this bialgebroid. Furthermore, they are needed for the definition of an antipode.

A weak Hopf algebra is a weak k-bialgebra with a k-linear map $S : H \to H$, called the *antipode*, such that, for all $h \in H$,

$$\sum h_{(1)}S(h_{(2)}) = \Pi^L(h), \quad \sum S(h_{(1)})h_{(2)}S(h_{(3)}) = S(h), \quad \sum S(h_{(1)})h_{(2)} = \Pi^R(h).$$

The antipode S is an anti-algebra and anti-coalgebra map. Furthermore,

$$\Pi^L = \overline{\Pi}^R \circ S, \qquad \Pi^R = \overline{\Pi}^L \circ S, \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$S \circ \Pi^L = \Pi^R \circ S, \qquad S \circ \Pi^R = \Pi^L \circ S. \tag{3.14}$$

Given a weak bialgebra H, a *right H-comodule algebra* is defined in [2, Definition 2.1] as a k-algebra A with a right H coaction $\varrho : A \to A\otimes H$, such that for all $a, b \in A$,

$$\varrho(ab) = \varrho(a)\varrho(b), \tag{3.15}$$

and

$$\sum a_{[0]} \otimes \Pi^L(a_{[1]}) = \sum 1_{[0]}a \otimes 1_{[1]}. \tag{3.16}$$

As shown in [2, Definition 2.1] and [13, Proposition 4.10], given the multiplicativity of ϱ (3.15), the condition (3.16) is equivalent to each one of the following statements (which we list here for future reference):

$$\varrho^2(1) = \sum 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]}1_{(1)} \otimes 1_{(2)}, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\varrho^2(1) = \sum 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{(1)}1_{[1]} \otimes 1_{(2)}, \tag{3.18}$$

$$\sum a_{[0]} \otimes \overline{\Pi}^R(a_{[1]}) = \sum a1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]}, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\sum 1_{[0]} \otimes \overline{\Pi}^R(1_{[1]}) = \varrho(1), \tag{3.20}$$

$$\sum 1_{[0]} \otimes \Pi^L(1_{[1]}) = \varrho(1). \tag{3.21}$$

Dually, a *right H-module coalgebra* is defined as a coalgebra C and a right H-module such that, for all $h, k \in H$ and $c \in C$,

$$\Delta_C(ch) = \sum c_{(1)}h_{(1)}\otimes c_{(2)}h_{(2)}, \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_C(chk) = \sum \varepsilon_C(ch_{(2)})\varepsilon(h_{(1)}k). \tag{3.23}$$

Note that condition (3.22) expresses the comultiplicativity of the action, and hence it is dual to condition (3.15). The condition (3.23) is dual to (3.17). As is the case for comodule algebras, various equivalent formulations of condition (3.23) are possible (cf. [13, Proposition 4.11] for details).

Left H-comodule algebras and left H-module coalgebras can be defined in a similar way.

Comodule algebras and module coalgebras of weak bialgebras provide one with examples of weak entwining structures. More precisely, given a right H-comodule algebra A and a right H-module coalgebra C, one defines a k-linear map

$$\psi_R : C{\otimes}A \to A{\otimes}C, \quad c{\otimes}a \mapsto \sum a_{[0]}{\otimes}ca_{[1]}. \tag{3.24}$$

The triple (A, C, ψ_R) is a right-right weak entwining structure (cf. [13, Theorem 4.14]). Similarly, given a left H-comodule algebra A and a left H-module coalgebra C, the k-linear map

$$\psi_L : A{\otimes}C \to C{\otimes}A, \quad a{\otimes}c \mapsto \sum a_{[-1]}c{\otimes}a_{[0]}, \tag{3.25}$$

is a left-left weak entwining map.

In particular, if H is a weak bialgebra, then H itself is a right H-module coalgebra with the action given by the product. Hence, for any right H-comodule algebra A, the map

$$\psi_R : H{\otimes}A \to A{\otimes}H, \quad h{\otimes}a \mapsto \sum a_{[0]}{\otimes}ha_{[1]} \tag{3.26}$$

is a right-right weak entwining map. Therefore, there is a corresponding projection

$$p_R : A \otimes H \to A \otimes H, \qquad a \otimes h \mapsto \sum a1_{[0]} \otimes h1_{[1]}, \tag{3.27}$$

and the A-coring $\mathfrak{C} = \mathrm{Im}\ p_R$ as in Proposition 3.1. Explicitly, the structure maps for $\mathfrak{C}$ come out as

$$\sum b'(a1_{[0]} \otimes h1_{[1]})b = \sum b'ab_{[0]} \otimes hb_{[1]},$$

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sum 1_{[0]} \otimes h1_{[1]}) = \sum(1_{[0]} \otimes h_{(1)}1_{[1]}) \otimes_A (1 \otimes h_{(2)}),$$

$$\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sum 1_{[0]} \otimes h1_{[1]}) = \sum 1_{[0]}\varepsilon(h1_{[1]}).$$

The category of right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules is isomorphic to the category of weak relative Hopf modules. In particular, A is such a module, hence $g = \varrho(1) = \sum 1_{[0]}{\otimes}1_{[1]}$ is a grouplike element in $\mathfrak{C}$. Let $B = A^{coH} = A_g^{co\mathfrak{C}}$. Following [14], the extension of algebras $B \subseteq A$ is called a *weak Hopf-Galois H-extension* if A is a Galois comodule, i.e., $\mathfrak{C}$ is a Galois coring, or, equivalently, the map

$$\mathrm{can}_A : A \otimes_B A \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad \mathrm{can}_A(a \otimes_B b) = a(\sum 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]})b = \sum ab_{[0]} \otimes b_{[1]}$$

is an isomorphism of A-corings. A weak Hopf algebra H is a weak Hopf-Galois extension of its (right) coinvariant subalgebra $H^{coH} = \mathrm{Im}\ \overline{\Pi}^R$ (cf. [14, Proposition 2.7]).

Obviously, a weak Hopf-Galois extension is a weak coalgebra-Galois extension. In fact, the above example of a weak Hopf algebra as a weak Hopf-Galois extension is a special case of the general construction of extensions over comodule subalgebras.

This construction follows a similar pattern as in the case of Hopf algebras (cf. [12, 34.2]) and is described in the following

Example 3.3. Let H be a k-flat weak Hopf algebra, and let A be a left comodule subalgebra of H, i.e., a (unital) subalgebra such that $\Delta(A) \subseteq H \otimes A$. Let $A^R = \operatorname{Im} \overline{\Pi}^R \cap A$. Then $J = A^R H$ is a coideal in H, since, for all $a \in A^R$ and $h \in H$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(ah) &= \sum a_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes a_{(2)}h_{(2)} \\
&= \sum a_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes (a_{(2)} - \overline{\Pi}^R(a_{(2)}))h_{(2)} + \sum a_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes \overline{\Pi}^R(a_{(2)})h_{(2)} \\
&= \sum a_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes (a_{(2)} - \overline{\Pi}^R(a_{(2)}))h_{(2)} + \sum a1_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes 1_{(2)}h_{(2)} \\
&= \sum a_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes (a_{(2)} - \overline{\Pi}^R(a_{(2)}))h_{(2)} + \sum ah_{(1)} \otimes h_{(2)} \in H \otimes J \oplus J \otimes H,
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by (3.19) (remember that H is a right H-comodule algebra) and the final inclusion is inferred from the assumption $\Delta(a) \in H \otimes A$ and from the fact that $\overline{\Pi}^R$ is a projection. Furthermore,

$$\varepsilon(ah) = \sum \varepsilon(a1_{(1)})\varepsilon(1_{(2)}h) = \varepsilon(\overline{\Pi}^R(a)h) = 0.$$

Thus $C = H/J$ is a coalgebra with the coproduct and counit induced by the canonical projection $\pi : H \to C$, $\Delta_C = (\pi \otimes \pi) \circ \Delta$, $\varepsilon_C \circ \pi = \varepsilon$. Obviously, C is a right H-module with the multiplication, for all $h \in H$ and $c \in C$,

$$ch = \pi(\tilde{h}h), \qquad \tilde{h} \in \pi^{-1}(c).$$

In fact, C is a right H-module coalgebra, as π is a coalgebra map and Δ is comultiplicative, hence, for all $h \in H$, $c \in C$ and $\tilde{h} \in \pi^{-1}(c)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_C(ch) &= \sum \pi(\tilde{h}_{(1)}h_{(1)}) \otimes \pi(\tilde{h}_{(2)}h_{(2)}) = \sum \pi(\tilde{h}_{(1)})h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h}_{(2)})h_{(2)} \\
&= \sum \pi(\tilde{h})_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h})_{(2)}h_{(2)} = \sum c_{(1)}h_{(1)} \otimes c_{(2)}h_{(2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This calculation has exactly the same form as a corresponding calculation for Hopf algebras. A slightly different computation that makes use of (3.12) and the counitality of π, proves the condition (3.23). Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_C(chk) &= \varepsilon_C(\pi(\tilde{h}hk)) = \varepsilon(\tilde{h}hk) = \sum \varepsilon(\tilde{h}h_{(2)})\varepsilon(h_{(1)}k) \\
&= \sum \varepsilon_C(\pi(\tilde{h}h_{(2)}))\varepsilon(h_{(1)}k) = \sum \varepsilon_C(ch_{(2)})\varepsilon(h_{(1)}k).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (H, C, ψ_R), where

$$\psi_R : C \otimes H \to H \otimes C, \qquad c \otimes h \mapsto \sum h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h}h_{(2)}), \qquad \tilde{h} \in \pi^{-1}(c), \tag{3.28}$$

is a right-right weak entwining structure. Furthermore, H is an entwined module over (H, C, ψ_R) with the coaction

$$\varrho^H : H \to H \otimes C, \qquad h \mapsto \sum h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(h_{(2)}).$$

Note also that $A \subseteq B = H^{coC}$, as, for all $a \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varrho^H(a) &= \sum a_{(1)} \otimes \pi(a_{(2)}) \\
&= \sum a_{(1)} \otimes \pi(a_{(2)} - \overline{\Pi}^R(a_{(2)})) + \sum a_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\overline{\Pi}^R(a_{(2)})) = \sum a1_{(1)} \otimes \pi(1_{(2)}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows form the facts that $\Delta(a) \in H \otimes A$, the definition of π and by (3.19). Now define the map

$$\sigma : H \otimes C \to H \otimes_B H, \qquad h \otimes c \mapsto hS\tilde{h}_{(1)} \otimes_B \tilde{h}_{(2)}, \qquad \tilde{h} \in \pi^{-1}(c).$$

The map σ is well defined, since, if $c = 0$, then $\tilde{h} = \sum_i a^i h^i$, with $a^i \in A^R$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i hS(a^i h^i)_{(1)} \otimes_B (a^i h^i)_{(2)} &= \sum_i hS{h^i}_{(1)} S{a^i}_{(1)} \otimes_B {a^i}_{(2)} {h^i}_{(2)} \\
&= \sum_i hS{h^i}_{(1)} S{a^i}_{(1)} {a^i}_{(2)} \otimes_B {h^i}_{(2)} \\
&= \sum_i hS{h^i}_{(1)} \Pi^R(a^i) \otimes_B {h^i}_{(2)} \\
&= \sum_i hS{h^i}_{(1)} S\overline{\Pi}^R(a^i) \otimes_B {h^i}_{(2)} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows by the fact that S is an anti-algebra map, the second one is a consequence of $\Delta(a) \in H \otimes A \subseteq H \otimes B$, then the definition of a counit is used, and finally a relationship between barred and unbarred right projection (cf. [12, 36.11] or equation (4.1) below) yields the penultimate equality. The map σ is clearly a left H-module, right C-comodule map. Furthermore, for all $h, \tilde{h} \in H$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma \circ \overline{\mathrm{can}}(h \otimes_B \tilde{h}) &= \sum h\tilde{h}_{(1)} S\tilde{h}_{(2)} \otimes_B \tilde{h}_{(3)} = \sum h\Pi^L(\tilde{h}_{(1)}) \otimes_B \tilde{h}_{(2)} \\
&= \sum h\varepsilon(1_{(1)}\tilde{h}_{(1)}) 1_{(2)} \otimes_B \tilde{h}_{(2)} = \sum h\varepsilon(1_{(1)}\tilde{h}_{(1)}) \otimes_B 1_{(2)}\tilde{h}_{(2)} \\
&= h \otimes \tilde{h},
\end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality follows by the fact that A is assumed to be a unital comodule subalgebra of H, so $\Delta(1) \in H \otimes A \subseteq H \otimes B$.

In this way we have proven that every comodule subalgebra of a weak Hopf algebra H yields a weak coalgebra-Galois extension $B \subseteq H$. Note that the canonical entwining map computed directly from the retraction σ above (cf. Example 3.2) comes out as, for all $c \in C$, $h \in H$ and $\tilde{h} \in \pi^{-1}(c)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_R^\sigma(c \otimes h) &= \overline{\mathrm{can}}(\sum S\tilde{h}_{(1)} \otimes_B \tilde{h}_{(2)} h) = \sum S\tilde{h}_{(1)} \tilde{h}_{(2)} h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h}_{(3)} h_{(2)}) \\
&= \sum \Pi^R(\tilde{h}_{(1)}) h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h}_{(2)} h_{(2)}) = \sum 1_{(1)} h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h} 1_{(2)} h_{(2)}) \\
&= \sum h_{(1)} \otimes \pi(\tilde{h} h_{(2)}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality follows by the left comodule version of (3.16) (H is a left H-comodule algebra). Thus the canonical entwining ψ_R^σ coincides with the entwining ψ_R in (3.28), as expected.

4. A quest for an invertible weak entwining structure

Recent generalisations of the Schneider Theorem I (cf. [28]) and the Kreimer-Takeuchi theorem (cf. [23]) to general coalgebra-Galois extensions and coring-Galois extensions use bijectivity of the canonical entwining structure (cf. [8], [27]) or an entwining structure over a non-commutative ring (cf. [3]). As the aim of the present paper is to extend these results to weak coalgebra-Galois extensions, we need to find a proper definition of an invertible weak entwining structure. If we make the obvious choice, however, then our quest suffers immediate setback because of the following

Lemma 4.1. *If* (A, C, ψ_R) *is a right-right weak entwining structure such that* ψ_R *is a bijective map, then* (A, C, ψ_R) *is an entwining structure.*

Proof. For the k-linear inverse of ψ_R, write $\psi_R^{-1} = \sum_E c_E \otimes a^E$, so that, for all $a \in A$ and $c \in C$,

$$c \otimes a = \sum_{\alpha,E} {c^\alpha}_E \otimes {a_\alpha}^E, \qquad a \otimes c = \sum_{\alpha,E} {a^E}_\alpha \otimes {c_E}^\alpha.$$

Applying ψ_R^{-1} to relation (3.1) we obtain, for all $a, \tilde{a} \in A$ and $c \in C$,

$$\sum_{E,F} c_{EF} \otimes a^F \tilde{a}^E = \sum_E c_E \otimes (a\tilde{a})^E.$$

With these at hand, take any $a \in A$ and $c \in C$, and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha &= \sum_\alpha \psi_R \circ \psi_R^{-1}(a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha,E,F} \psi_R({c^\alpha}_{EF} \otimes a^F {1_\alpha}^E) = \sum_F \psi_R(c_F \otimes a^F) = a \otimes c. \end{aligned}$$

Now taking $a = 1$, we deduce that $\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha = 1 \otimes c$. This equality, together with the relation (3.2) imply

$$\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) a = \varepsilon_C(c) a,$$

i.e., (A, C, ψ_R) is a right-right entwining structure as claimed. □

Lemma 4.1 means that, if one wants to deal with weak entwining structures, one cannot assume that the entwining map be bijective. Instead we propose

Definition 4.2. An *invertible weak entwining structure* is a quadruple (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) such that

(a) (A, C, ψ_R) is a right-right weak entwining structure and (A, C, ψ_L) is a left-left weak entwining structure;
(b) $\psi_R \circ \psi_L = p_R$ and $\psi_L \circ \psi_R = p_L$;
(c) for all $c \in C$,

$$\sum_E \varepsilon_C(c_E) 1^E = \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha).$$

The introduction of a bijective entwining map in all generalisations of Schneider's and the Kreimer-Takeuchi theorems, replaces the original assumption that a Hopf algebra has a bijective antipode. Indeed, the entwining map associated to a Doi-Koppinen datum (A, C, H) is bijective provided H has a bijective antipode. The notion of an invertible weak entwining structure introduced in Definition 4.2 is motivated by the following observation.

Proposition 4.3. *Let* H *be a weak Hopf algebra with a bijective antipode,* A *a right* H*-comodule algebra and* C *a right* H*-module coalgebra. Then* (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) *with* ψ_R *given by equation (3.24) and*

$$\psi_L : A \otimes C \to C \otimes A, \qquad a \otimes c \mapsto \sum c S^{-1} a_{[1]} \otimes a_{[0]},$$

is an invertible weak entwining structure.

Proof. First we need to prove that (A, C, ψ_L) is a left-left weak entwining structure. Suffices it to check that there exists a weak bialgebra $\bar{H}$ such that A is a left $\bar{H}$-comodule algebra, C is a left $\bar{H}$-module coalgebra and the map ψ_L has the form given in equation (3.25). Take $\bar{H} = H^{op}$, the opposite algebra to H. When viewed as an element of $\bar{H}$, an element h of H is denoted by $\bar{h}$. The right H-multiplication on C, makes C a left $\bar{H}$-module by the formula

$$\bar{h}c = ch.$$

Since the right action of H on C is comultiplicative, so is the derived left $\bar{H}$-action. Furthermore, condition (3.23) implies for all $h, k \in H$ and $c \in C$,

$$\varepsilon_C(\bar{k}\bar{h}c) = \varepsilon_C(chk) = \sum \varepsilon_C(ch_{(2)})\varepsilon(h_{(1)}k) = \sum \varepsilon(\bar{k}\bar{h}_{(1)})\varepsilon_C(\bar{h}_{(2)}c),$$

(note the use of equation (3.23)). This is one of the equivalent conditions for C to be a left $\bar{H}$-module coalgebra. Consider a k-linear map

$$\lambda : A \to \bar{H} \otimes A, \qquad a \mapsto \sum S^{-1}a_{[1]} \otimes a_{[0]}.$$

Since the antipode is an anti-coalgebra map, so is S^{-1}, hence λ is a left $\bar{H}$-coaction. Furthermore, ϱ is a multiplicative map, while S^{-1} is an anti-algebra map, thus $\lambda : A \to \bar{H} \otimes A$ is a multiplicative map. Finally, we can use equations (3.14) and (3.21) to compute

$$\sum \Pi^R(S^{-1}1_{[1]}) \otimes 1_{[0]} = \sum S^{-1}\Pi^L(1_{[1]}) \otimes 1_{[0]} = \sum S^{-1}1_{[1]} \otimes 1_{[0]}.$$

This is the left-handed version of condition (3.21). Thus we conclude that A is a left $\bar{H}$-comodule algebra, C is a left $\bar{H}$-module coalgebra and ψ_L has the form (3.25) with the coaction λ. Hence (A, C, ψ_L) is a left-left weak entwining structure.

Next we prove that the conditions (b) in Definition 4.2 are satisfied. The projections corresponding to weak entwining maps ψ_R and ψ_L come out as

$$p_R(a \otimes c) = \sum a1_{[0]} \otimes c1_{[1]}, \qquad p_L(c \otimes a) = \sum cS^{-1}1_{[1]} \otimes 1_{[0]}a.$$

Take any $a \in A$ and $c \in C$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_L \circ \psi_R(c \otimes a) &= \psi_L(\sum a_{[0]} \otimes ca_{[1]}) = \sum ca_{[1](2)}S^{-1}a_{[1](1)} \otimes a_{[0]} \\ &= \sum cS^{-1}(a_{[1](1)}Sa_{[1](2)}) \otimes a_{[0]} = \sum cS^{-1}\Pi^L(a_{[1]}) \otimes a_{[0]} \\ &= \sum cS^{-1}1_{[1]} \otimes 1_{[0]}a = p_L(c \otimes a). \end{aligned}$$

The third equality follows from the fact that the antipode (and hence also its inverse) is an anti-algebra map, the fourth one is the defining property of the antipode in a weak Hopf algebra. The fifth equality follows from the definition of a right H-comodule algebra, equation (3.16). Next use the first of equations (3.14) and the first of equations (3.13) to note that, for all $h \in H$,

$$S^{-1}\Pi^R(h) = \Pi^L(S^{-1}h) = \sum \varepsilon(h1_{(1)})1_{(2)} = \overline{\Pi}^R(h). \tag{4.1}$$

Use this to compute

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_R\circ\psi_L(a\otimes c) &= \psi_R(\sum cS^{-1}a_{[1]}\otimes a_{[0]}) = \sum a_{[0]}\otimes cS^{-1}(a_{[1](2)})a_{[1](1)}\\ &= \sum a_{[0]}\otimes cS^{-1}((Sa_{[1](1)})a_{[1](2)}) = \sum a_{[0]}\otimes cS^{-1}\Pi^R(a_{[1]})\\ &= \sum a_{[0]}\otimes c\overline{\Pi}^R(a_{[1]}) = \sum a1_{[0]}\otimes c1_{[1]} = p_R(a\otimes c).\end{aligned}$$

Again the third equality follows from the fact that the antipode (and hence also its inverse) is an anti-algebra map and the fourth one is the defining property of the antipode in a weak Hopf algebra. The fifth equality follows from property (4.1), while the sixth one is the consequence of the fact that A is a right H-comodule algebra, hence equation (3.19) holds.

Finally we need to check that the maps ψ_L and ψ_R satisfy property (c) in Definition 4.2, i.e., that, for all $c\in C$, $\sum 1_{[0]}\varepsilon_C(c1_{[1]}) = \sum\varepsilon_C(cS^{-1}1_{[1]})1_{[0]}$. Compute

$$\begin{aligned}\sum\varepsilon_C(cS^{-1}1_{[1]})1_{[0]} &= \sum\varepsilon_C(c1_{(2)})\varepsilon(1_{(1)}S^{-1}1_{[1]})1_{[0]}\\ &= \sum\varepsilon_C(c1_{(2)}\varepsilon(1_{(1)}S^{-1}1_{[1]}))1_{[0]}\\ &= \sum\varepsilon_C(c\Pi^L(S^{-1}1_{[1]}))1_{[0]}\\ &= \sum\varepsilon_C(c\overline{\Pi}^R(1_{[1]}))1_{[0]} = \sum\varepsilon_C(c1_{[1]})1_{[0]}.\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from the compatibility between the counit and the action of H on a right module coalgebra C, equation (3.23). The third equality is simply the definition of Π^L, while the fourth equality follows from property (4.1). Finally, the last equality is obtained by the use of equation (3.20). Thus we conclude that (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) is an invertible weak entwining structure as claimed. □

In particular we obtain

Corollary 4.4. *Let H be a weak Hopf algebra with a bijective antipode and let A be a right H-comodule algebra. Then (A, H, ψ_R, ψ_L) with ψ_R given by equation (3.26) and*

$$\psi_L : A\otimes C\to C\otimes A,\qquad a\otimes h\mapsto\sum hS^{-1}a_{[1]}\otimes a_{[0]}, \tag{4.2}$$

is an invertible weak entwining structure.

Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that H itself is a right H-module coalgebra with the action given by the product, and from Proposition 4.3. □

As an immediate consequence of Definition 4.2 one obtains the following

Lemma 4.5. *Let (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) be an invertible weak entwining structure. Then:*

(1) $\psi_R\circ p_L = \psi_R$,
(2) $\psi_L\circ p_R = \psi_L$.

Proof. (1) Note that $\psi_R(C\otimes A)\subseteq \text{Im } p_R$. Since p_R is a projection, $p_R\circ\psi_R = \psi_R$, and the condition (a) in Definition 4.2 implies

$$\psi_R\circ p_L = \psi_R\circ\psi_L\circ\psi_R = p_R\circ\psi_R = \psi_R.$$

Statement (2) is proven in a similar way. □

As is often the case with (weak) entwining structures, the notion of an invertible weak entwining structure has the clearest meaning in terms of corings.

Proposition 4.6. *Let* (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) *be an invertible weak entwining structure and let* $\mathfrak{C} = \mathrm{Im}\ p_R$ *and* $\mathfrak{D} = \mathrm{Im}\ p_L$ *be the corresponding* A*-corings. Then the restrictions of the entwining maps*

$$\psi_L : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{D}, \qquad \psi_R : \mathfrak{D} \to \mathfrak{C}$$

are inverse isomorphisms of A*-corings.*

Proof. Since p_R and p_L are projections, the conditions (b) in Definition 4.2 imply that restrictions of ψ_R and ψ_L to Im p_L and Im p_R respectively, are inverse isomorphisms of k-modules. Furthermore, for all $a \in A$ and $c \in C$,

$$\psi_R(\sum_E a(c_E \otimes 1^E)) = \psi_R(\sum_{E,F} c_{EF} \otimes a^E 1^F) = \psi_R(\sum_E c_E \otimes a^E) = p_R(a \otimes c) = \sum_\alpha a 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha,$$

where the second equality follows from (3.5) and the penultimate equality follows from the property (b) in Definition 4.2. On the other hand

$$a\psi_R(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E) = a\psi_R(\psi_L(1 \otimes c)) = ap_R(1 \otimes c) = \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha,$$

where again the second equality follows from the property (b) in Definition 4.2. Thus ψ_R is a left A-module map. Moreover, Lemma 4.5 implies

$$\psi_R(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a) = \psi_R \circ p_L(c \otimes a) = \psi_R(c \otimes a) = \sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha.$$

On the other hand

$$\psi_R(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E)a = \sum_\alpha (1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha)a = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} 1_\alpha a_\beta \otimes c^{\alpha\beta} = \sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha,$$

where the last equality follows from equation (3.1). Hence ψ_R is an (A, A)-bimodule map. Similarly it can be shown that ψ_L is an (A, A)-bimodule map. Thus ψ_R is an (A, A)-bimodule isomorphism with the inverse ψ_L.

Next we show that the map ψ_R is counital. Take any $c \in C$ and $a \in A$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{C}}(\psi_R(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a)) &= \sum_\alpha a_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \varepsilon_C(c^\alpha) a \\ &= \sum_E \varepsilon_C(c_E) 1^E a = \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{D}}(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a). \end{aligned}$$

To derive the first equality we have used Lemma 4.5(1) and then the definition of the counit in $\mathfrak{C}$. The second equality follows from equation (3.2), while the third one is the consequence of propety (c) in Definition 4.2. The final equality follows from the definition of the counit in $\mathfrak{D}$. Thus ψ_R is a counital map. Similarly one shows that ψ_L is a counital map.

Finally we need to prove that ψ_R and ψ_L are comultiplicative maps. Take any $a \in A$ and $c \in C$, and use Lemma 4.5(1) and the definition of the coproduct in $\mathfrak{C}$ to compute

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}} \circ \psi_R(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a) = \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(1)} \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(2)}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\psi_R \otimes_A \psi_R) \circ \Delta_{\mathfrak{D}}(\sum_E c_E \otimes 1^E a) &= \sum_E \psi_R(c_{E(1)} \otimes 1) \otimes_A \psi_R(c_{E(2)} \otimes 1^E a) \\
&= \sum_{E,F} \psi_R(c_{(1)}{}_E \otimes 1) \otimes_A \psi_R(c_{(2)}{}_F \otimes 1^{EF} a) \\
&= \sum_E \psi_R(c_{(1)}{}_E \otimes 1^E) \otimes_A \psi_R(c_{(2)} \otimes a) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} 1_\alpha \otimes c_{(1)}{}^{\alpha} \otimes_A a_\beta \otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\beta} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} 1_\alpha a_{\beta\gamma} \otimes c_{(1)}{}^{\alpha\gamma} \otimes_A 1 \otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\beta} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha} a_\alpha \otimes c^{\alpha}{}_{(1)} \otimes_A 1 \otimes c^{\alpha}{}_{(2)} = \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sum_\alpha a_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality is the definition of the coproduct in $\mathfrak{D}$, the second follows from the definition of a left-left entwining structure, more precisely, equation (3.7). Next we use the definition of the left A-multiplication in $\mathfrak{D}$ and the fact that ψ_R is an (A, A)-bimodule map. The property (b) in Definition 4.2 implies the fourth equality. Then we use the definition of right A-multiplication in $\mathfrak{C}$. The final two equalities follow from the properties of a right-right entwining structure, equations (3.1) and (3.3). Similarly one proves that ψ_L is comultiplicative and thus completes the proof of the proposition. □

In the case of entwining structures, the inverse ψ^{-1} of a right-right entwining map ψ is a left-left entwining map. Furthermore, if A is a right entwined module over (A, C, ψ), then it is a left entwined module over (A, C, ψ^{-1}) (cf. [6, Section 6]). Similarly, for an invertible weak entwining structure one proves

Corollary 4.7. *Let (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) be an invertible weak entwining structure. If $A \in \mathcal{M}(\psi_R)^C_A$, then $A \in {}^C_A\mathcal{M}(\psi_L)$ with the coaction*

$${}^A\varrho(a) = \psi_L(\sum a1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]}).$$

Proof. If $A \in \mathcal{M}(\psi_R)^C_A$, then A is a right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule. The corresponding grouplike element is $g = \varrho^A(1) = \sum 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]}$. But then A is also a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule with the coaction $a \mapsto ag \otimes_A 1$. By Proposition 4.6, the map $\psi_L : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{D}$ is an isomorphism of A-corings, hence the left $\mathfrak{C}$-coaction of A induces a left $\mathfrak{D}$-coaction on A,

$${}^A\varrho(a) = \psi_L(ag) \otimes_A 1 \simeq \psi_L(ag).$$

Thus $A \in {}^C_A\mathcal{M}(\psi_L)$ with coaction ${}^A\varrho(a) = \psi_L(\sum a1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]})$, as stated. □

5. WEAK COALGEBRA GALOIS EXTENSIONS WITH COSEPARABLE COALGEBRAS

Once we have understood how to define an invertible weak entwining structure we can proceed to apply Theorem 2.1 to deduce a criterion for an algebra to be a weak coalgebra-Galois extension. This is a subject of the present and following sections.

First recall that a coalgebra C is called a *coseparable* coalgebra provided the coproduct has a retraction in the category of C-bicomodules. Equivalently, C is a coseparable coalgebra if there exists a *cointegral*, i.e., a k-module map $\delta : C\otimes C \to k$ that is *colinear*, meaning, for all $c, c' \in C$,

$$\sum c_{(1)}\delta(c_{(2)}\otimes c') = \sum \delta(c\otimes c'_{(1)})c'_{(2)}, \tag{5.1}$$

and such that $\delta \circ \Delta_C = \varepsilon_C$. Over an algebraically closed field the notion of coseparability is equivalent to the notion of cosimplicity.

Theorem 5.1. *Let (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) be an invertible weak entwining structure with a k-projective algebra A and k-projective coalgebra C. Denote by p_R the projection corresponding to (A, C, ψ_R) and by $\mathfrak{C} = \mathrm{Im}\ p_R$ the corresponding A-coring. Suppose that*

1. *A is a right weak entwined module with product μ and coaction ϱ^A;*
2. *the map $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A : A\otimes A \to \mathfrak{C}$, $a\otimes a' \to a\varrho^A(a')$ is surjective;*
3. *C is a coseparable coalgebra.*

Then A is a weak C-Galois extension of the coinvariants B and is C-equivariantly projective as a left B-module (i.e., A is a projective left B module and the multiplication map $B\otimes A \to A$ has a left B-linear, right C-colinear section).

The strategy of the proof of Theorem 5.1 is to show that it is a special case of Theorem 2.1. As the first step we need to show that there is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule map $\mathfrak{C} \to A\otimes A$ that splits the canonical map $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A : A\otimes A \to \mathfrak{C}$. By Corollary 4.7, given an invertible weak entwining structure such that A is a right weak entwined module, A is a left weak entwined module. In the case of invertible entwining structures, there is a bijective correspondence between left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear maps $\mathfrak{C} = A \otimes C \to A\otimes A$ with left C-colinear maps $C \to A\otimes A$. A similar statement can be proven for invertible weak entwining structures.

Lemma 5.2. *Given an invertible weak entwining structure (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) with $A \in \mathcal{M}(\psi_R)^C_A$, view $A\otimes A$ as a left $\mathfrak{C} = (\mathrm{Im}\ p_R)$-comodule with the coaction*

$$^{A\otimes A}\varrho : A\otimes A \to \mathfrak{C}\otimes A, \qquad a\otimes a' \mapsto \sum a1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]}\otimes a'.$$

Then there is the bijective correspondence between left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear maps $f : \mathfrak{C} \to A\otimes A$ and k-linear maps $\hat{f} : C \to A\otimes A$ such that

$$(^A\varrho\otimes A) \circ \hat{f} = (p_L\otimes A) \circ (C\otimes \hat{f}) \circ \Delta_C, \tag{5.2}$$

where $^A\varrho : A \to C\otimes A$ is a left C-coaction as in Corollary 4.7.

Proof. For all $c \in C$, write $\hat{f}(c) = \sum c^{\langle 1\rangle}\otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and apply $\psi_R\otimes A$ to equation (5.2) to obtain

$$\sum \psi_R \circ \psi_L(c^{\langle 1\rangle}1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]})\otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle} = \sum \psi_R \circ p_L(c_{(1)}\otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle})\otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle}. \tag{5.3}$$

Since, for all $a \in A$, $\sum a1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]} \in \mathrm{Im}\ p_R$, the definition of an invertible weak entwining structure, Definition 4.2(b), implies that $\psi_R \circ \psi_L(\sum a1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]}) = \sum a1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]}$. Applying Lemma 4.5 to the right hand side of (5.3), one obtains that the equation (5.2) is equivalent to

$$\sum c^{\langle 1\rangle}1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]}\otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle} = \sum \psi_R(c_{(1)}\otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle})\otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle}, \tag{5.4}$$

i.e.,

$$\sum c^{\langle 1\rangle}1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]}\otimes_A 1\otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle} = \sum (1\otimes c_{(1)})\otimes_A c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle}\otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle}. \tag{5.5}$$

Take a k-linear map $\hat{f} : C \to A \otimes A$ that satisfies condition (5.2) and define a left A-module map $f : \mathfrak{C} \to A \otimes A$ by $f(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) = \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \hat{f}(c^\alpha)$. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^{A\otimes A}\varrho \circ f(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) &= \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha c^{\alpha\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]} \otimes_A 1 \otimes c^{\alpha\langle 2\rangle} \\
&= \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha (1 \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(1)}) \otimes_A c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle} \\
&= \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(1)} \otimes_A c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from property (5.4). On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathfrak{C} \otimes_A f) \circ \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a1_\alpha \otimes c_{(1)}{}^\alpha \otimes_A f(1_\beta \otimes c_{(2)}{}^\beta) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(1)} \otimes_A 1_\beta c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\beta\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\beta\langle 2\rangle} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} a1_\alpha 1_{\beta\gamma} \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(1)}{}^\gamma \otimes_A c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\beta\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\beta\langle 2\rangle} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a1_\alpha 1_\beta \otimes c^{\alpha\beta}{}_{(1)} \otimes_A c^{\alpha\beta}{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^{\alpha\beta}{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle} \\
&= \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(1)} \otimes_A c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we first use the definition of the coproduct in $\mathfrak{C}$ in Proposition 3.1, then the definition of f in terms of the map $\hat{f}$, next the definition of right A-multiplication in $\mathfrak{C}$, and finally properties (3.1) and (3.3) of a right-right weak entwining structure. This proves that f is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear map.

Conversely, take a left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear map $f : \mathrm{Im}\ p_R \to A \otimes A$ and define $\hat{f} : C \to A \otimes A$ by $\hat{f}(c) = f(\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]} \otimes_A 1 \otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle} &= \sum_\alpha {}^{A\otimes A}\varrho(f(1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha)) \\
&= \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(1)} \otimes_A f(1 \otimes c^\alpha{}_{(2)}) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} 1_{\alpha\beta} \otimes c_{(1)}{}^\beta \otimes_A f(1 \otimes c_{(2)}{}^\alpha) \\
&= \sum_\alpha (1 \otimes c_{(1)}) \cdot 1_\alpha \otimes_A f(1 \otimes c_{(2)}{}^\alpha) \\
&= \sum (1 \otimes c_{(1)}) \otimes_A c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c_{(2)}{}^{\langle 2\rangle},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of the left $\mathfrak{C}$-coaction in A in terms of the grouplike element $\sum 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]}$. The second equality is a consequence of the fact that f is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear map, while the third one is the property (3.3) of a right-right entwining structure. The fourth equality follows from the definition of the right A-action in $\mathfrak{C}$, and the last one is obtained by the use of the fact that f is a left A-linear map and then by the definition of $\hat{f}$. So we obtain (5.5), i.e., the condition (5.2) is satisfied, as required. □

Before the start of the proof of Theorem 5.1 it is also useful to prove the following

Lemma 5.3. *Take an invertible weak entwining structure* (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) *with a* k*-flat coalgebra* C*. Assume that* A *is a weak entwined module as in assumption (1) in Theorem 5.1 and that the canonical map* $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A : A \otimes A \to \mathrm{Im}\, p_R$ *has a* k*-linear section* τ*. Set* $\hat{\tau}(c) = \tau(\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha)$*. Then*

$$(C \otimes \mu \otimes C) \circ ({}^A\varrho \otimes \varrho^A) \circ \hat{\tau} = (C \otimes \psi_R) \circ (C \otimes C \otimes 1) \circ \Delta_C, \tag{5.6}$$

where ${}^A\varrho : A \to C \otimes A$ *is a left* C*-coaction as in Corollary 4.7.*

Proof. This can be shown as follows. Write $\hat{\tau}(c) = \sum c^{\langle 1\rangle} \otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle}$. Since τ is a section of $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A$,

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A \circ \tau(\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) := \sum c^{\langle 1\rangle} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[0]} \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1]} = \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha. \tag{5.7}$$

Start with the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum {c^{\langle 1\rangle}}_{[-1]} \otimes {c^{\langle 1\rangle}}_{[0]} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[0]} \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1]} &= \sum \psi_L(c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]} \otimes 1_{[1]}) 1_{[0']} \psi_R(1_{[1']} \otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle}) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha, E} {1_{[1]}}_E \otimes (c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]})^E 1_{[0']} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_\alpha \otimes {1_{[1']}}^\alpha,
\end{aligned}$$

which is simply the definition of left and right C-coactions and also uses (3.1). Applying $\psi_R \otimes C$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum \psi_R({c^{\langle 1\rangle}}_{[-1]} \otimes {c^{\langle 1\rangle}}_{[0]} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[0]}) \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1]} &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta,E} {(c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]})^E}_\beta 1_{[0']\gamma} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{\alpha\delta} \otimes {1_{[1]E}}^{\beta\gamma\delta} \otimes {1_{[1']}}^\alpha \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]} 1_\beta 1_{[0']\gamma} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{\alpha\delta} \otimes {1_{[1]}}^{\beta\gamma\delta} \otimes {1_{[1']}}^\alpha \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\delta} c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]} (1_{[0']} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_\alpha)_\delta \otimes {1_{[1]}}^\delta \otimes {1_{[1']}}^\alpha \\
&= \sum_\delta c^{\langle 1\rangle} 1_{[0]} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[0]\delta} \otimes {1_{[1]}}^\delta \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1]} \\
&= \sum c^{\langle 1\rangle} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[0]} \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1](1)} \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1](2)} \\
&= \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(1)} \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(2)} \\
&= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} 1_{\alpha\beta} \otimes {c_{(1)}}^\beta \otimes {c_{(2)}}^\alpha = \sum_\alpha \psi_R(c_{(1)} \otimes 1_\alpha) \otimes {c_{(2)}}^\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

The first and the third equality follow from the (multiple) use of property (3.1) of a right-right weak entwining structure and the second follows from Definition 4.2 (b). The fourth and fifth equalities are consequences of the fact that A is a right entwined module. The sixth equality follows from equation (5.7), while the penultimate equality follows from equation (3.3). Now we apply $\psi_L \otimes C$ and use the fact that

$$\sum {c^{\langle 1\rangle}}_{[-1]} \otimes {c^{\langle 1\rangle}}_{[0]} {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[0]} \otimes {c^{\langle 2\rangle}}_{[1]} \in \mathrm{Im}\, p_L \otimes C,$$

to compute

$$\begin{aligned}\sum c^{\langle 1\rangle}{}_{[-1]}\otimes c^{\langle 1\rangle}{}_{[0]}c^{\langle 2\rangle}{}_{[0]}\otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle}{}_{[1]} &= \sum_{\alpha}\psi_L\circ\psi_R(c_{(1)}\otimes 1_\alpha)\otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\alpha}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha,E} c_{(1)E}\otimes 1^E 1_\alpha\otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\alpha}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha,E} c_{(1)}\otimes\varepsilon_C(c_{(2)E})1^E 1_\alpha\otimes {c_{(3)}}^{\alpha}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} c_{(1)}\otimes 1_\beta 1_\alpha\otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\beta\alpha}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha} c_{(1)}\otimes 1_\alpha\otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the definition of an invertible weak entwining structure, Definition 4.2 (b). Then we have used property (3.8) of a left-left weak entwining structure, then Definition 4.2 (c) and (3.4). The last equality follows by (3.1). Thus we obtain (5.6) as required. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

Proof. (Theorem 5.1) Take $\mathfrak{C}=\operatorname{Im} p_R$. By the k-projectivity assumptions, $A\otimes C$ is a projective k-module. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ is a direct summand in $A\otimes C$, it is a projective k-module too. Let τ be a k-linear splitting of $\widetilde{\operatorname{can}}_A : A\otimes A\to\mathfrak{C}$, and set $\hat\tau(c)=\tau(\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha\otimes c^\alpha)$. Let δ be a cointegral of C and consider

$$\hat\kappa=(\delta\otimes A\otimes A)\circ(C\otimes{}^A\varrho\otimes A)\circ(C\otimes\hat\tau)\circ\Delta_C, \tag{5.8}$$

where we view A as a left C-comodule with coaction ${}^A\varrho$ as in Corollary 4.7. Using the colinearity of δ, one easily checks that $\hat\kappa$ is a left C-colinear map, i.e.,

$$({}^A\varrho\otimes A)\circ\hat\kappa=(C\otimes\hat\kappa)\circ\Delta_C.$$

Since ${}^A\varrho(A)\subseteq\operatorname{Im} p_L$, and p_L is a projection, this implies that $\hat\kappa$ satisfies the property (5.2) in Lemma 5.2. Thus the map

$$\kappa(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\otimes c^\alpha)=\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\hat\kappa(c^\alpha) \tag{5.9}$$

is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule map. Explicitly, writing $\hat\tau(c)=\sum c^{\langle 1\rangle}\otimes c^{\langle 2\rangle}$, the map κ comes out as

$$\kappa(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\otimes c^\alpha)=\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\delta({c^\alpha}_{(1)}\otimes {{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 1\rangle}{}_{[-1]}){{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 1\rangle}{}_{[0]}\otimes{{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 2\rangle}. \tag{5.10}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\operatorname{can}}_A\circ\kappa(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\otimes c^\alpha) &= \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\delta({c^\alpha}_{(1)}\otimes{{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 1\rangle}{}_{[-1]}){{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 1\rangle}{}_{[0]}{{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 2\rangle}{}_{[0]}\otimes{{c^\alpha}_{(2)}}^{\langle 2\rangle}{}_{[1]}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a1_\alpha\delta({c^\alpha}_{(1)}\otimes{c^\alpha}_{(2)})1_\beta\otimes{{c^\alpha}_{(3)}}^{\beta}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a1_\alpha 1_\beta\otimes c^{\alpha\beta}=\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha\otimes c^\alpha.\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from equation (5.6) in Lemma 5.3, while the third one is a consequence of the definition of a cointegral. The final equality follows from equation (3.1). Thus κ is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear splitting of $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A$. So by Corollary 2.2, A is a principal $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule, hence $\mathrm{can}_A : A\otimes_B A \to \mathfrak{C}$ is an isomorphism of A-corings and A is a projective left B-module. In order to show that A is C-equivariantly projective as a left B-module we need to show that there exists a section of the left B-action ${}_A\varrho : B\otimes A \to A$ in ${}_B\mathcal{M}^C$, where ${}_A\varrho$ is given by the multiplication μ in A, i.e., a left B-module, right C-comodule map σ such that ${}_A\varrho \circ \sigma = A$. The projectivity of A as a left B-module means that there exists a left B-linear map $\tilde{\sigma} : A \to B\otimes A$ such that ${}_A\varrho \circ \tilde{\sigma} = A$. Now we can construct

$$\sigma : A \to B\otimes A, \qquad \sigma = (B\otimes A\otimes\delta)\circ(B\otimes\varrho^A\otimes C)\circ(\tilde{\sigma}\otimes C)\circ\varrho^A. \tag{5.11}$$

The map σ is a composition of left B-linear maps, therefore left B-linear. We now show that σ is a right C-colinear section of ${}_A\varrho$. The fact that σ is right C-colinear follows from the colinearity of the cointegral δ, equation (5.1) (this is a standard argument for coseparable coalgebras). Explicitly, note that, writing $\tilde{\sigma}(a) = \sum a^{(1)}\otimes a^{(2)} \in B\otimes A$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varrho^{B\otimes A}\circ\sigma(a) &= \sum {a_{[0]}}^{(1)}\otimes {{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[0][0]}\otimes {{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[0][1]}\delta({{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[1]}\otimes a_{[1]})\\
&= \sum {a_{[0]}}^{(1)}\otimes {{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[0]}\otimes {{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[1](1)}\delta({{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[1](2)}\otimes a_{[1]})\\
&= \sum {a_{[0]}}^{(1)}\otimes {{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[0]}\delta({{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[1]}\otimes a_{[1](1)})\otimes a_{[1](2)}\\
&= \sum {a_{[0][0]}}^{(1)}\otimes {{a_{[0][0]}}^{(2)}}_{[0]}\delta({{a_{[0][0]}}^{(2)}}_{[1]}\otimes a_{[0][1]})\otimes a_{[1]}\\
&= (\sigma\otimes C)\circ\varrho^A(a).
\end{aligned}$$

We can express the fact that $\tilde{\sigma}$ is a section of ${}_A\varrho$ in the current notation as $\sum a^{(1)}a^{(2)} = a$. Using this property, the fact that, by the definition of the coinvariants B, the right C-coaction is left B-linear, and the fact that δ is a cointegral of C, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
{}_A\varrho(\sigma(a)) &= \sum {a_{[0]}}^{(1)}{{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[0]}\delta({{a_{[0]}}^{(2)}}_{[1]}\otimes a_{[1]})\\
&= \sum({a_{[0]}}^{(1)}{a_{[0]}}^{(2)})_{[0]}\delta(({a_{[0]}}^{(1)}{a_{[0]}}^{(2)})_{[1]}\otimes a_{[1]})\\
&= \sum a_{[0][0]}\delta(a_{[0][1]}\otimes a_{[1]}) = \sum a_{[0]}\delta(a_{[1](1)}\otimes a_{[1](2)})\\
&= \sum a_{[0]}\varepsilon_C(a_{[1]}) = a.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that σ is a left B-module, right C-comodule section of the multiplication map ${}_A\varrho$ as required, and thus completes the proof of the theorem. □

In view of Corollary 4.4, Theorem 5.1 implies the following

Corollary 5.4. *Let H be a coseparable, k-projective weak Hopf algebra with bijective antipode and let A be a k-projective right H-comodule algebra. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be the coring defined as the image of the projection p_R given by (3.27). If the map*

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A : A\otimes A \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad a\otimes b \mapsto \sum ab_{[0]}\otimes b_{[1]}$$

is surjective, then A is a weak Hopf-Galois H-extension of the coinvariants B and it is H-equivariantly projective as a left B-module.

6. WEAK COALGEBRA GALOIS EXTENSIONS WITH COALGEBRAS PROJECTIVE AS COMODULES

The aim of this section is to prove that, within an invertible weak entwining structure, the projectivity of C as a C-comodule coupled with the surjectivity of the canonical map leads to a weak coalgebra-Galois extension. As a corollary we obtain a weak Hopf algebra version of the Kreimer-Takeuchi theorem [23, Theorem 1.7] that states that for a right comodule algebra A of a finite-dimensional Hopf algebra, the surjectivity of the canonical map implies that A is a Hopf-Galois extension, and that A is projective over its coinvariants.

Theorem 6.1. *Let (A, C, ψ_R, ψ_L) be an invertible weak entwining structure and let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a coring corresponding to the weak entwining (A, C, ψ_R) as in Proposition 3.1. Suppose that:*

(a) A is a right weak entwined module with coaction ρ^A;
(b) C is k-flat and projective as a left C-comodule;
(c) $(A\otimes A)^{\mathrm{co}C} = A\otimes B$, where $B = A^{\mathrm{co}C}$;
(d) $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A : A\otimes A \to \mathfrak{C}$, $a \otimes b \mapsto \sum ab_{[0]} \otimes b_{[1]}$ is surjective.

Then $B \subseteq A$ is a weak coalgebra-Galois extension and A is k-relatively projective as a left B-module.

Proof. First, notice that from Remark 2.3 we can deduce that the assumption (c) above implies that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}-}(A, A\otimes A) = {}^{\mathrm{co}\mathfrak{C}}(A\otimes A)_g = B\otimes A$, where $g = \sum 1_{[0]}\otimes 1_{[1]}$. More precisely,

$$(A\otimes A)^{\mathrm{co}C} = \{\sum_i a_i\otimes b_i \in A\otimes A \mid \sum_i a_i\otimes g b_i = \sum_i a_i\otimes b_i g\},$$

hence the usual twist map $a\otimes b \mapsto b\otimes a$ gives rise to an isomorphism ${}^{\mathrm{co}\mathfrak{C}}(A\otimes A)_g \simeq (A\otimes A)^{\mathrm{co}C}$. Consequently, the assumption (c) is equivalent to the statement that ${}^{\mathrm{co}\mathfrak{C}}(A\otimes A)_g = B\otimes A$, i.e., as explained in Remark 2.3, the condition (b) in Theorem 2.1 is fulfilled. Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a coring corresponding to (A, C, ψ_L). By Proposition 4.6, the coring $\mathfrak{C}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{D}$, hence $\mathfrak{C}$ is a left $\mathfrak{D}$-comodule via $(\psi_L \otimes_A \mathfrak{C}) \circ \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}$. The correspondence between left $\mathfrak{D}$-comodules and left entwined modules then yields that $\mathfrak{C}$ is a left entwined module, hence, in particular, a left C-comodule. For $\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha \in \mathfrak{C}$, the left C-coaction comes out as

$${}^{\mathfrak{C}}\varrho(\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha,E} {c^\alpha}_{(1)E} \otimes {1_\alpha}^E \otimes {c^\alpha}_{(2)}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_\alpha c_{(1)} \otimes 1_\alpha \otimes {c_{(2)}}^\alpha &= \sum_\alpha c_{(1)} \otimes \varepsilon({c_{(2)}}^\alpha)1_\alpha \otimes c_{(3)} \\ &= \sum_E c_{(1)} \otimes \varepsilon(c_{(2)E})1^E \otimes c_{(3)} \\ &= \sum_E c_{(1)E} \otimes 1^E \otimes c_{(2)}. \qquad (6.1)\end{aligned}$$

The first equality comes from (3.4), the second is a consequence of the part (c) of Definition 4.2 of an invertible weak entwining structure, and the final equality is implied by (3.8). In view of this we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\mathfrak{C}}\varrho\Big(\sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha\Big) &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta,E} {c_{(1)}}^{\beta}{}_{E} \otimes {1_{\alpha\beta}}^{E} \otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha,E} c_{(1)E} \otimes 1^E 1_\alpha \otimes {c_{(2)}}^{\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{E,F} c_{(1)FE} \otimes 1^E 1^F \otimes c_{(2)} \\ &= \sum_{E} c_{(1)E} \otimes 1^E \otimes c_{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows by the properties of right-right weak entwining structures in particular (3.3), the second by part (b) of Definition 4.2, the third by the previous computation (6.1) and the final equality by (3.5). This implies that the map

$$\ell : C \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad c \mapsto \sum_\alpha 1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha \tag{6.2}$$

is a left C-comodule map. As $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A$ is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule map (hence a $\mathfrak{D}$-comodule map by Proposition 4.6), it is a left C-comodule map. Since $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A$ is surjective and C is projective as a left C-comodule, the map

$$\mathrm{Hom}^{C-}(C, A\otimes A) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Hom}^{C-}(C,\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A)} \mathrm{Hom}^{C-}(C, \mathfrak{C})$$

is surjective. This implies that there exists $\hat{f} \in \mathrm{Hom}^{C-}(C, A\otimes A)$ such that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A \circ \hat{f} = \ell \tag{6.3}$$

with ℓ given by (6.2). Any left C-comodule map $\hat{f} : C \to A\otimes A$ satisfies assumption (5.2) of Lemma 5.2, hence there is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule map

$$f : \mathfrak{C} \to A\otimes A, \qquad f\Big(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha\Big) = \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \hat{f}(c^\alpha).$$

Take any $a\in A$ and $c \in C$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A \circ f\Big(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha\Big) &= \widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A\Big(\sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \hat{f}(c^\alpha)\Big) = \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A(\hat{f}(c^\alpha)) \\ &= \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \ell(c^\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} a1_\alpha 1_\beta \otimes c^{\alpha\beta} = \sum_\alpha a1_\alpha \otimes c^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Second equality follows by left linearity of $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A$, the third by (6.3), the fourth by (6.2) and the last by the property (3.1) of a right-right weak entwining map. This means that f is a left $\mathfrak{C}$-colinear section of $\widetilde{\mathrm{can}}_A$. With additional assumptions this means Theorem 2.1 can be applied to obtain desired result. □

Theorem 6.1 leads to the following weak Hopf algebra version of the Kreimer-Takeuchi theorem [23, Theorem 1.7].

Corollary 6.2. *Let k be a field and let H be a finite dimensional weak Hopf algebra over k. Let A be a right H-comodule algebra and $\mathfrak{C}$ be the A-coring associated to the* *corresponding right-right weak entwining map* ψ_R *given by* (3.26). *If*

$$\widetilde{\operatorname{can}}_A : A \otimes A \to \mathfrak{C}, \qquad a \otimes b \mapsto \sum ab_{[0]} \otimes b_{[1]}$$

is surjective, then $B \subseteq A$ *is a weak Hopf-Galois extension and* A *is projective as a left (and right)* B*-module.*

Proof. First, [4, Theorem 2.10] implies that H has a bijective antipode, hence by Corollary 4.4, (A, H, ψ_R, ψ_L) is an invertible weak entwining structure with ψ_R given by (3.26) and ψ_L given by (4.2). Second, as the dual H^* of a finite dimensional weak Hopf algebra is a weak Hopf algebra, [4, Theorem 3.11] implies that H^* is a quasi-Frobenius algebra (i.e., it is self-injective). Now combination of the Faith-Walker theorem [19, Theorem 24.12] that asserts that every injective module over a quasi-Frobenius algebra is projective and [20, Theorem 1.3] that states that a quasi-co-Frobenius coalgebra is projective as a comodule, implies that H is a projective left (and right) H-comodule (cf. [20, Remark 1.5]). Since k is a field, the condition (c) in Theorem 6.1 is automatically satisfied. Thus Theorem 6.1 yields the required assertion. The right B-projectivity of A follows from the left-right symmetry (see the discussion at the end of this section). □

Every weak Hopf algebra is a Hopf algebroid over $R = \operatorname{Im} \Pi^L$ and a right H-comodule algebra A is also a comodule algebra over this Hopf-algebroid (cf. [12, 36.9, 37.15] or see the original papers [18], [30], [26] and [9] for more details). A right-right weak entwining structure (A, H, ψ_R) with ψ_R given by (3.26) can be understood as a right-right entwining structure over R. With this identification, one can also deduce Corollary 6.2 from [3, Corollary 4.3].

By a theorem of Lin (cf. [24, Proposition 5]), every right co-Frobenius coalgebra is projective as a left comodule, hence Theorem 6.1 can be applied to co-Frobenius coalgebras (or, even more generally, to quasi-co-Frobenius coalgebras of Gómez-Torrecillas and Năstăsescu, cf. [20, Theorem 1.3]). In particular, one obtains in this way a weak Hopf algebra version of the Beattie-Dăscălescu-Raianu extension of the Kreimer-Takeuchi theorem to co-Frobenius Hopf algebras (cf. [1, Theorem 3.1]).

Finally let us mention that, throughout, we worked in a *right-handed convention*, taking right comodules (such as right Galois-comodules), right coalgebra extensions (algebras A with a right C-coaction), etc. Clearly, all the results presented here can also be presented in a *left-handed convention.* For example, assuming that the canonical map $\widetilde{\operatorname{can}}_M$ in Theorem 2.1 is a split epimorphism in the category of right $\mathfrak{C}$-comodules, we can deduce that M^* is a left Galois $\mathfrak{C}$-comodule. In the case of invertible weak entwining structures the distinction between left- and right-handed conventions is blurred in the sense that every right weak coalgebra-Galois extension (corresponding to a right-right weak entwining ψ_R) is a left weak coalgebra-Galois extension (corresponding to ψ_L) and vice versa. In particular this means that the assumption that C is projective as a left C-comodule in Theorem 6.1 can be replaced by the assumption that C is a projective right C-comodule. As a consequence, in this case, one obtains that A is a weak coalgebra-Galois extension, k-relatively projective as a right B-module. The same arguments together with the left-right symmetry of the notions of a quasi-Frobenius algebra and a quasi-co-Frobenius coalgebra imply that A in Corollary 6.2 is projective as a right B-module.

Acknowledgements

We thank Gabriella Böhm for comments. Tomasz Brzeziński thanks the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council for an Advanced Fellowship.

References

[1] M. Beattie, S. Dăscălescu and S. Raianu, *Galois extensions for co-Frobenius Hopf algebras*, J. Algebra 198 (1997), 164–183.

[2] G. Böhm, *Doi-Hopf modules over weak Hopf algebras*, Comm. Algebra 28 (2000), 4687–4698.

[3] G. Böhm, *Galois theory for Hopf algebroids*, Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0409513 (2004).

[4] G. Böhm, F. Nill and K. Szlachányi, *Weak Hopf algebras I. Integral theory and C^*-structure*, J. Algebra 221 (1999), 385–438.

[5] G. Böhm and K. Szlachányi, *A coassociative C^*-quantum group with nonintegral dimension*, Lett. Math. Phys. 35 (1996), 437–456.

[6] T. Brzeziński, *On modules associated to coalgebra-Galois extensions*, J. Algebra 215 (1999), 290–317.

[7] T. Brzeziński, *The structure of corings. Induction functors, Maschke-type theorem, and Frobenius and Galois-type properties,* Alg. Rep. Theory, 5 (2002), 389–410.

[8] T. Brzeziński, *Galois comodules,* Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0312159 v. 3 (2004).

[9] T. Brzeziński, S. Caenepeel and G. Militaru, *Doi-Koppinen modules for quantum groupoids*, J. Pure Appl. Alg. 175 (2002), 45–62.

[10] T. Brzeziński and P.M. Hajac,. *Coalgebra extensions and algebra coextensions of Galois type,* Commun. Algebra, 27 (1999), 1347–1367.

[11] T. Brzeziński and S. Majid, *Coalgebra bundles*, Commun. Math. Phys. 191 (1998), 467–492.

[12] T. Brzeziński and R. Wisbauer *Corings and Comodules.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2003).

[13] S. Caenepeel, E. De Groot, *Modules over weak entwining structures*, AMS Contemp. Math. 267 (2000), 31–54.

[14] S. Caenepeel and E. De Groot, *Galois theory for weak Hopf algebras*, Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0406186 (2004).

[15] S. Caenepeel and E. De Groot and J. Vercruysse, *Galois theory for comatrix corings: Descent theory, Morita theory, Frobenius and separability properties*, Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0406436 (2004), Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. to appear.

[16] S. Caenepeel, G. Militaru and S. Zhu, *Frobenius and Separable Functors for Generalized Hopf Modules and Nonlinear Equations*, LNM 1787, Springer, Berlin (2002)

[17] L. El Kaoutit and J. Gómez-Torrecillas, *Comatrix corings: Galois corings, descent theory, and a structure theorem for cosemisimple corings.* Math. Z. 244 (2003), 887–906.

[18] P. Etingof and D. Nikshych, *Dynamical quantum groups at roots of 1*, Duke Math. J. 108 (2001), 135–168.

[19] C. Faith, *Algebra II. Ring Theory*, Springer, Berlin (1976)

[20] J. Gómez-Torrecillas and C. Năstăsescu, *Quasi-co-Frobenius coalgebras*, J. Algebra 174 (1995), 909–923.

[21] L. Kadison, *Depth two and the Galois coring,* Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0408155 (2004).

[22] L. Kadison, *An action-free characterization of weak Hopf-Galois extensions,* Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0409589 (2004).

[23] H.F. Kreimer and M. Takeuchi, *Hopf algebras and Galois extensions of an algebra*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 30 (1981), 675–692.

[24] B.I. Lin, *Semiperfect coalgebras*, J. Algebra 49 (1977), 357–373.

[25] F. Nill, *Axioms for a weak bialgebra*, Preprint ArXiv math.QA/9805104 (1998)

[26] Schauenburg, P., *Weak Hopf algebras and quantum groupoids*, Banach Center Publ. 61 (2003), 171–188.
[27] P. Schauenburg and H.-J. Schneider, *On generalized Hopf-Galois extensions*, Preprint ArXiv math.QA/0405184 (2004).
[28] H.-J. Schneider, *Principal homogeneous spaces for arbitrary Hopf algebras,* Israel J. Math, 72 (1990), 167–195.
[29] M. Sweedler, *The predual theorem to the Jacobson-Bourbaki theorem,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 213 (1975), 391–406.
[30] K. Szlachányi, *Finite quantum groupoids and inclusions of finite type*, Fields Inst. Comm. 30 (2001), 393–407.
[31] R. Wisbauer, *Weak corings*, J. Algebra 245 (2001), 123–160.
[32] R. Wisbauer, *On Galois corings,* [in:] *Hopf Algebras in Noncommutative Geometry and Physics*, S. Caenepeel and F. Van Oystaeyen (eds.), Marcel Dekker, New York (2004), p. 309.
[33] R. Wisbauer, *On Galois comodules,* Preprint arXiv:math.RA/0408251 (2004).

Department of Mathematics, University of Wales Swansea, Singleton Park,
Swansea SA2 8PP, U.K.
E-mail address: `T.Brzezinski@swansea.ac.uk (T Brzezinski)`
E-mail address: `marbt@swansea.ac.uk (RB Turner)`
E-mail address: `maapw@swansea.ac.uk (AP Wrightson)`